

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FROM THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

for the relations with the
UNITED STATES CONGRESS

Thirteenth Meeting

MESSINA/TAORMINA

28-31 March 1978

SUMMARY OF THE WORKING SESSIONS

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR COMMITTEES
AND INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

25 July 1978

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	
1. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	3
2. PROGRAMME OF THE VISIT	4
2. <u>JOINT WORKING SESSIONS</u>	
<u>Wednesday, 29 March 1978</u>	
<u>First Plenary Session</u>	7
1. EC and US Policies in the Mediterranean	7
Parallel Working Groups:	
2. Joint Working Group on Human Rights	15
3. Working Group on Energy	22
4. Working Group on Economic Issues	29
<u>Thursday, 30 March 1978</u>	
<u>Second Plenary Session</u>	31
5. Economic issues	32
<u>Third Plenary Session</u>	36
6. Report from Working Group on Energy	36
7. Report from Joint Working Group on Human Rights	37
8. Final comments and proposals	39
9. Co-chairmen's conclusions	40
<u>Friday, 31 March 1978</u>	
3. <u>MEETING IN PALERMO</u>	41
 <u>ANNEX I:</u> Address given by President COLOMBO	
<u>ANNEX II:</u> List of documents	

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

From the United States Congress

Leo J. RYAN, Chairman of the Delegation	(D-California)
James C. CORMAN	(D-California)
Floyd J. FITHIAN	(D-Indiana)
Sam GIBBONS	(D-Florida)
James P. JOHNSON	(R-Colorado)
Trent LOTT	(R-Mississippi)
James G. MARTIN	(R-North Carolina)
Shirley N. PETTIS	(R-California)
Larry WINN, Jr.	(R-Kansas)

From the European Parliament

Mario ZAGARI, Chairman of the Delegation, Vice-President of the European Parliament	
Jan BAAS	Liberal, Netherlands
Martin BANGEMANN	Liberal, Federal Republic of Germany
Ronald BROWN	Socialist, United Kingdom
Pierre Bernard COUSTE	European Progressive Democrat, France
Fernand L. DELMOTTE	Socialist, Belgium
Maurice FAURE	Socialist, France
Gerhard FLAMIG	Socialist, Federal Republic of Germany
Colette FIESCH	Liberal, Luxembourg
Carlo GALLUZZI	Communist, Italy
Horst HAASE	Socialist, Federal Republic of Germany
Hans Edgar JAHN	Christian-Democrat, Federal Republic of Germany
Silvio LEONARDI	Communist, Italy
Charles B. McDONALD	Christian-Democrat, Ireland
Harry NOTENBOOM	Christian-Democrat, Netherlands
Patrick POWER	European Progressive Democrat, Ireland
John PRESCOTT	Socialist, United Kingdom
Camillo RIPAMONTI	Christian-Democrat, Italy
Geoffrey RIPPON	European Conservative, United Kingdom
Mario SCELBA	Christian-Democrat, Italy
James SCOTT-HOPKINS	European Conservative, United Kingdom
Hanna WALZ	Christian-Democrat, Federal Republic of Germany

1.2 PROGRAMME OF THE VISIT

Tuesday, 28 March 1978

- Individual arrival of members of the delegation from the European Parliament and transfer to hotel:
Grand Albergo Capotaormina,
Taormina-Mare
Tel: (0942) 24 000
Telex: 98147

N.B.

- All working meetings will be held in the Grand Albergo Capotaormina

- 17.00 - Internal preparatory meeting of the European Parliament Delegation (Etna Room)
- 19.00 approx. - Arrival by special 'plane and welcome of the US Congress Delegation at Catania Military Airbase 'Signonella'. Transfer by coach to Grand Albergo Capotaormina.
- 20.30 - Welcome dinner offered by Mr Mario ZAGARI, Chairman of the European Parliament Delegation (Salon Naxos).

Wednesday, 29 March 1978

- First half-day of working meetings

- 08.45 - 10.30 - Plenary Session I (Mamertina Room)
United States and European Community policies in the Mediterranean:
 - Eastern Mediterranean (Cyprus, Greece and Turkey);
 - EC global approach (cooperation agreements, Common Agricultural Policy, and enlargement perspectives);
 - Political and security interests in the area.

- 10.30 - 10.45 - Coffee break

- 10.45 - 12.30 - Continuation of Plenary Session I

- Lunch - Free

- Second half-day of working meetings

- 14.30 - 16.30 - Two parallel working groups
 - (a) Joint Working Group on Human Rights (Mamertina Room)
 - (b) Working Group on Energy (Etna Room)
- 16.30 - 16.45 - Coffee break

- 16.45 - 18.45 - Two parallel working groups
- 16.45 - 18.45 (a) Economic issues: growing difficulties in international trade (Mamertina Room)
 - Present state of GATT negotiations;
 - New rules for agricultural trade?
 - Bilateral US/EC trade;
 - Trilateral trade issues with Japan;
 - Monetary problems underlying trade difficulties.
- 16.45 - 18.15 - (b) Working Group on Energy (Etna Room)
- 20.30 - Official Dinner given by Mr Emilio COLOMBO
President of the European Parliament

Grand Albergo Capotaormina
Salone delle Feste

Thursday, 30 March 1978

- Third half-day of working meetings
- 08.45 - 10.45 - Plenary Session II (Mamertina Room)
Continuation of discussion on economic issues
- 10.45 - 11.00 - Coffee break
- 11.00 - 13.30 - Plenary Session III (Mamertina Room)
 - (a) Reports from Working Groups (half hour)
 - (b) Summing up and general discussion
- Press Conference
- Lunch - Own arrangements
- Afternoon - Free (optional visit to Taormina, upper town)
- 20.00 - Farewell dinner of the two delegations hosted by the European Parliament Delegation

San Domenico Palace,
Piazza San Domenico 5,
Tel: 23701

Friday, 31 March 1978

PALERMO

- 07.30 - After breakfast, departure by coach for Palermo
- Late morning - Arrival at Palermo

- 11.30 - Meeting with representatives of the Government
 and of the Parliament of the Autonomous Region
 of Sicily (Palazzo dei Normanni, Salla Gialla)
- Luncheon reception offered by the Sicilian
 authorities.
- 13.15 - US Congress delegation leaves by coach for
 Palermo Airport, Punta Raisi.
- 14.00 - US Congress delegation leaves by special 'plane
 from Palermo Airport.

SECTION 2: JOINT WORKING SESSIONS

Wednesday, 29 March 1978

First Plenary Session

2.1 EC and US Policies in the Mediterranean

The meeting began at 09.40. Mr ZAGARI and Mr RYAN welcomed the members to the 13th meeting of the delegations.

Mr ZAGARI introduced his report (PE 52.706). He pointed out that many questions were being posed as the enlargement of the Community to include Greece, Portugal and Spain came nearer. He underlined the importance of the political aspect of enlargement, in that it would strengthen these countries' democracies. He described certain of the possible economic effects of enlargement and reminded the meeting that the current major economic problems in the European Community of unemployment, inflation, and low growth, should not be worsened by the enlargement.

Mr ZAGARI said that the micro-conflicts in the Middle East, and the horn of Africa could easily degenerate into macro-conflicts, and these would affect all the countries of the Mediterranean, and others. The goal of ensuring the Mediterranean Sea was a sea of peace was vital. He regretted that the efforts to extend security guarantees of Mediterranean countries at the Belgrade meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) had not succeeded.

Mr WINN (Republican, Kansas) then presented his paper 'US Interests in the Eastern Mediterranean' (PE 53.029). Concentrating rather more on the military aspects of the Eastern Mediterranean situation, Mr WINN underlined that political freedom and economic interests in this area of the world were based on the strong security provided by the North Atlantic Alliance. The United States had often focused attention on the vital interests of the flanks of this Alliance, especially Greece and Turkey. The Eastern Mediterranean situation had been imperilled by the rift between these two countries. Current US policy was damaging to relations within the Alliance and needed re-orientating. He called for an end to the Congressionally imposed US arms embargo which had not had the effect that the Congress had desired on Turkey's actions towards Cyprus. He also called for the ratification of the Defence Cooperation Agreement signed between the United States and Turkey in 1976. He felt that it was important for Greece to rejoin the NATO command and for the two countries to negotiate steadfastly the disputes which they currently had in the Aegean and over Cyprus.

Mr JAHN introduced his working document on 'Certain political aspects of the situation in the Eastern Mediterranean (Cyprus, Greece and Turkey)' (PE 52.811). He drew the meeting's attention to the great deal of alarm that was felt in Europe on the situation in this area. He recalled that at an earlier meeting in 1974 the European Parliament delegation had seriously warned against a US arms embargo of Turkey¹. He said that the recent changes in governments in both Turkey and Greece would not necessarily lead to an improvement in the situation. He mentioned the 'warm and friendly' meeting between Mr Ecevit and Mr Karamanlis in Montreux, where all problems between the two countries, Turkey and Greece, were discussed. Mr Ecevit had recently appointed Professor Säuser to draft proposals for future constitutional changes in Cyprus. There were general signs that military relations between Greece and the United States, and between Turkey and the United States were improving. In his view the ratification of the US-Turkey arms agreement, and the withdrawal of the arms embargo would be a great act of détente.

Mr JAHN stressed that the solution to the problems in the area did not simply depend on military solutions. He proposed that a mini-Marshall plan be established to rescue Turkey from its grave economic situation. It was not simply a question of losing Turkey from the Western Alliance, if some economic help were not given.

Mr FAURE reflected on the complementarity of the Mediterranean countries, the Islamic countries on the south coast, the Christian European countries on the north, each with historical ties with the others. The European Community faced two problems, the internal problem of the oncoming enlargement, and the external problem of the Community's relations with the poorer countries of the south (north/south relations).

He pointed out that the effect of enlargement could weaken the EC if the major economic and political problems were not resolved, the latter including the basic inadequacy of the current decision-making system for a Community of 12 states.

Mr FAURE cited certain economic and agricultural problems described in Mr BANGEMANN's report and suggested that these problems would be increased, not for the countries joining the Community but for the southern states of the Mediterranean and those in the Middle East, whose produce was very similar to that of Greece, Portugal and Spain, and southern France and Italy. He did however underline the need for a thorough-going regional policy within the Community.

¹ See summary of the 1974 Working Session PE 38.748.

He felt that relations with the Arab world could be extremely difficult, pointing out the intellectual subtlety needed in the on-going Euro-Arab dialogue. As long as conflict continued in the Middle East the Mediterranean would stay the sea of conflict, which it had been for many hundreds of years. Mr FAURE concluded by praising the practical results so far of the EC Mediterranean global approach, and stressed that the chances of peace in this area would be enhanced by European unity.

Mrs PETTIS (Republican, California) echoed certain of Mr WINN's remarks, in saying that the US arms embargo on Turkey had worsened matters in that area, as it had worsened the Cyprus situation. Greece had recently refused to sign the US-Greece Defence Agreement and this made ratification of the 1976 US-Turkey Agreement less likely. Lifting the embargo would encourage better relations. She recalled that Turkey had a 1300 mile boundary with the USSR, that there were 24 Soviet divisions in the Caucasus, that Turkey housed a number of western strategic intelligence stations, and that it was militarily very important for the defence of the North Atlantic Alliance. Greece too was strategically very important. She underlined that it was not a question of a choice between allies but one of maintaining both ties with Greece and with Turkey, by ensuring that both their military contributions to the alliance were strong.

She concluded by asking whether in the absence of the lifting of the US arms embargo against Turkey, it would be possible for Europe to ensure a larger part of Turkey's military needs. Mr JAHN answered that it was already doing so.

After a brief break, Mr RYAN introduced Mr BANGEMANN who introduced his working document on 'Aspects of Mediterranean agriculture' (PE 52.750).

Mr BANGEMANN drew attention to the differences between the Community's Mediterranean agriculture and agriculture in the rest of the EEC. The common agricultural policy had not been a great success in southern Europe - and particularly the Mezzogiorno - for a number of reasons. Farming incomes there were particularly low and agriculture received little stimulus from the industrial and tertiary sectors. For certain products such as wine, olive oil and citrus fruits, competition from third countries was making its effect felt and imports of products from such countries were increasing at a faster rate than those from the Mezzogiorno. These facts had to be borne in mind when considering the consequences of enlargement.

While maintaining that agriculture was the biggest problem posed by enlargement, Mr BANGEMANN said that he was optimistic about the chances of finding a solution. It was not enough, however, for Member States to import more agricultural produce from the southern regions of the Community for their problems to be solved; industrialization was the only answer.

Enlargement of the Community would, furthermore, necessitate a new decision-making process. Enlargement would not in itself make the Community any stronger. Political integration had not made any progress since the enlargement to nine because of the discord between the Member States.

Finally, Mr BANGEMANN drew attention to the fact that in some countries such as Greece and Turkey, hostility to the Community was due to the identification of the Community with NATO. The Atlantic alliance had an important role but Mediterranean policy was for the Community even more essential.

Mr FITHIAN (Democrat, Indiana) set out the majority view within the US House of Representatives on policy in the Eastern Mediterranean. He recalled that NATO was not merely a defensive - and hence non-offensive - alliance, but that it also had other functions.

Security was in any case more than a simple military problem. The US Congress had come out against a narrow interpretation of NATO's role, as the document presented by Senator SARBANES pointed out.¹ Congress had made known its opposition to the Greek colonels and now it was opposed to the Turkish military intervention in Cyprus. A total end to the embargo on American military supplies to Turkey would not in itself solve the problem of human rights in Cyprus which Turkey violated with its

¹ PE 52.840

military intervention in 1974. The embargo was thus an expression of Congress's refusal to accept that American arms should be used by an allied country against another weaker state and that by this means the political future of this country should be decided by military occupation.

The position expressed by some speakers during today's debate was therefore not the majority view in Congress.

Having commented on the lack of any pro-Turkish lobby in American public opinion, Mr FITHIAN echoed the views put forward in the document by Senator SARBANES who had written: 'if the seller cannot and does not limit effectively the uses to which such volumes of arms may be put, the only restraint on arms sales are the appetites of the buyers and the size of their purses'.

There was general agreement about the need to improve relations between the USA and Turkey on condition that Turkey withdrew from Cyprus. The document mentioned above clearly represented the majority point of view in Congress when it stated that the normalization of relations should follow and not precede the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus.

In conclusion, Mr FITHIAN said that he shared the views set out in the SARBANES document with one reservation, namely that he did not feel that Turkey's membership of NATO was essential to the Atlantic alliance.

Mr GALLUZZI made various points concerning the enlargement of the Community in relation to Mediterranean policy, strategic considerations and defence.

The matters raised in previous speeches today should not disguise the real dimensions and the seriousness of the situation in the Mediterranean. For these problems to be solved in the shortest time possible, it was necessary to attack them at their roots. We had to try to find global solutions whether we were dealing with the Middle East, Cyprus or the conflict in the Horn of Africa and all the protagonists must be involved. A determined effort was therefore needed to deal with underdevelopment using cooperation agreements as well as trade agreements. Democracy must be strengthened in the Community and extended beyond it, removing the imbalances which still existed. Democracy must be defended and strengthened in future member countries. The independent line which his group wished Europe to take did not conflict with the commitments given by Member States within the framework of the Atlantic alliance nor with the essence of US foreign policy.

Mr BAAS, referring to the Turkish situation, asked who today had the greater interest in normalizing relations: Turkey or the USA? The American administration had to take a clear final decision. Both Greece and Turkey were of prime military and strategic importance but this problem should not be seen as the only one or the most important one. To link normalization and military relations between the USA and these countries with a solution to the Cyprus problem, did not seem to be the best policy. In this context account should also be taken of the strong body of minority opinion in Congress.

Mr BAAS, having recalled that the most pressing problem for the USA was the conflict in the Horn of Africa, emphasized that Turkey was on the verge of bankruptcy, a situation that called for, and had so far been answered with, a steady flow of loans from American banks. It was therefore necessary to draw up a financial aid programme which would allow Turkey to maintain a healthy industry. A solution to the political problems would follow as a matter of course, for it should not be forgotten that the Turks are a highly sensitive people whose national pride is offended by the continuing embargo. The USA should consider the Turkish situation as a whole and lift the embargo at the earliest opportunity, not least because of Turkey's strategic value and the interests of the USA and the Atlantic alliance.

Mr SCELBA, as the only Sicilian member of parliament present, extended a warm greeting to the members of Congress and recalled that it was here in Taormina in 1955, when he was Prime Minister of Italy, that he concluded the proceedings of the Conference of Messina which opened the way to European integration and laid the foundations for the creation of the European Economic Community.

He said that peace was the key problem for the Eastern Mediterranean, a peace not threatened by local conflicts between neighbouring countries but by the confrontation between the big powers due to the expansionist policy of the USSR in the Mediterranean. Russia's aim, whether under the Czarist or Soviet régime, had for centuries been to assert its power in the Mediterranean. One of the reasons for the continuing conflict in the Middle East was that the USSR is opposed to any peaceful solution. Conquest of the Mediterranean was seen by them as a means of taking possession of Western Europe. Without NATO Europe would have come under the domination of the Soviet Union a long time ago.

Mr SCELBA said that politicians should look not just at Turkey but at other countries such as Libya which had provided the USSR with land for military bases. The involvement of the USSR in the conflict in the Horn of Africa was another extremely important issue. Mediterranean policy was thus just one part of world policy. One of the errors of the postwar period, had been to consider NATO as a defensive and military alliance and to neglect the role - which De Gasperi had emphasized - that it had in the economic development of the West. Politics, Mr SCELBA concluded, should also be concerned with moral values, especially those which Europe and the West as a whole shared and encouraged.

Mr LEONARDI said that, in his opinion, the speakers from the US Congress had neglected the role of the EEC as a regional organization keeping Greece and other countries within the family of countries with free democratic institutions. They had given greater emphasis to military and strategic considerations and not to the political and economic aspects of enlargement. This led to a narrow vision of the Eastern Mediterranean question. In his opinion, the sectoral policies (on agriculture, energy etc.,) pursued by the USA were weakening the Community, improving its capacity to find solutions to the problems of Greece and Turkey linking these countries to the West. The USA should therefore make efforts to strengthen the Community and not to weaken it as it was doing with its present energy policy.

Mr RIPAMONTI stressed that the SARBANES document quite rightly pointed out that the Atlantic alliance did not have a purely strategic and defence role. The other aspects of the Atlantic alliance had so far not been sufficiently developed. He therefore suggested that in future, greater attention should be given to NATO's role in the democratic development of the Member countries and as a support for democratic institutions. The Community and the USA ought to pursue a joint global strategy in the Mediterranean instead of the present piecemeal approach consisting of bilateral agreements between these two and the coastal states.

The Community's strategy in the Mediterranean called for a different approach by the USA towards the Community because only if the USA and the EEC were to pool their efforts could an earlier settlement be found to the problems of this area.

Mr WINN welcomed the suggestion made by Mr JAHN in his document that a mini-Marshall plan should be drawn up for Cyprus and extended to Turkey. The time was right for aid to these countries on the same lines as earlier aid to Portugal and support should be given to Turkey's application for assistance from the International Monetary Fund. He concluded by expressing his full agreement with the overall view put forward in

Mr JAHN's document and endorsed by other speakers, and with the desirability of lifting the military embargo and granting Turkey economic and financial aid.

Mr BROWN emphasized the important mediating role carried out by the United Kingdom in the Cyprus conflict even if the parties concerned had not always recognized or aided its efforts. He shared the view that economic aid should be given to Turkey without singling out specific issues but as part of an overall approach. The SARBANES document did not seem to offer any contribution to the solution of the Eastern Mediterranean problem. The United States ought to review its policy on oil imports as it had a destabilizing effect on prices.

The chairman, Mr RYAN, gave his own personal views. He felt that a distinction should be made between NATO's defensive role in general and its application to the Cyprus situation. The body of minority opinion in Congress was in fact very close to majority and there were very nearly as many in favour of ending the embargo as there were against. Because there was no pro-Turkish group in Congress the Greek case had been put unchallenged which made it difficult for members of Congress to achieve a clear and objective view of the problems involved.

Without doubt, the military embargo was weakening NATO and the pro-Greek argument did not stand up to close examination because it was wrong to think that to remain intransigent and put pressure on Turkey would be likely to induce it to make substantial concessions.

Europeans would have to take pains to explain to their NATO allies the Community's policy on the Eastern Mediterranean.

2.2 Joint Working Group on Human Rights

Mr COUSTE, chairman of the Joint Working Party drew the attention of members to pages 52 and 53 of the report of proceedings of the last meeting in Washington, which reproduced the working party's conclusions, and to the proposal regarding the future work of the working party contained in the paper 'On a concentrated approach by the Joint Working Party' (PE 52.738).

Mr COUSTE gave a brief summary of his working document. It was suggested in paragraph 10 that, for reasons of efficiency, the Joint Working Party should concentrate its efforts on the respect of certain fundamental rights. These are the right to life, the right to freedom and the right to security of the individual. These rights imply the abolition of slavery, torture, arbitrary imprisonment, cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment or treatment; the elimination of all discrimination on grounds of colour, religion, sex, political opinion or nationality; equality of treatment before the law and the non-retroactivity of penal laws; the right of asylum; and certain 'private' freedoms, the freedom of thought, conscience and religion and freedom of opinion and expression.

This list was not exhaustive but was intended to help spell out a 'working definition'.

The Joint Working Party could express its views regularly in the event of repeated and systematic violations of such rights, using the parliamentary techniques available, either jointly or separately.

The Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions of the European Parliament were considering the proposals for procedures for intervention put forward at the meeting in London in July 1977, which included the organization of joint hearings and joint fact-finding missions. It was also decided that the working party would intervene in the cases of emergency brought to its attention by Amnesty International or other recognized organizations. Such action had already been taken in specific cases by the co-chairmen of the working party.

Since the meeting of September 1976 it had been decided that human rights should be regularly placed on the agenda of meetings between the two delegations.

As regards future action, Mr COUSTE proposed that:

- joint emergency interventions should be continued,
- a document should be drawn up annually on the situation of human rights in the world for the use of parliamentary representatives based on the reports drawn up on this subject by the US Congress and by Amnesty International¹,
- extremely thorough legal studies should be made (by the department of the European Parliament and the US Congress) on
 - (a) the principle of non-interference in internal affairs and the protection of human rights,

¹ The US Congress has just published a report, by country, on the human rights situation (Country reports on human rights practices, 3 February 1978)

- (b) the right to political asylum and the reception of exiles and refugees,
- (c) the impact of the international campaign to abolish capital punishment, considered an inhuman and degrading punishment.

In order to improve joint consultation within the joint working party, Mr COUSTE proposed that the working party hold a half-day meeting before or after the next interparliamentary meeting. He also informed the working party that he had met President Carter in Paris on 5 January 1978 and that the President had expressed the desire to receive the European Parliament delegation on its next visit to the American capital.

Finally, Mr COUSTE said that the Political Affairs Committee of the European Parliament intended to organize a hearing in Brussels in May on the human rights situation in Argentina in connection with the World Cup competition. He felt it was desirable for the US Congress to be represented at that hearing.

Mr PRESCOTT confirmed that the Legal Affairs Committee of the European Parliament was considering the procedural aspects of the possibility of holding joint hearings and that the Political Affairs Committee of the European Parliament, which had been instructed to investigate the human rights situation in Argentina, on the basis of a motion for a resolution tabled by certain Members of Parliament, had applied to the Bureau of the European Parliament for authorization to organize a hearing on the human rights situation in Argentina, in particular in the light of the reports drawn up by Amnesty International about that country.

The reason why Argentina, rather than any other country, had been chosen for this hearing was that a specific motion for a resolution had been tabled. The hearing would take place, subject to the authorization of the Bureau of the European Parliament, towards the end of May. Persons to be invited would include representatives of Amnesty International and members of the Argentine Parliament. It was desirable also for the US Congress to be represented.

Mr PRESCOTT said that following intervention by President CARTER the Argentine Government had announced the names and places of detention of 3,000 political prisoners. There was therefore some hope that the hearing it was planned to hold would achieve some positive results.

Mr COUSTE said that on 13 March 1978 Mr PRESCOTT, rapporteur of the Political Affairs Committee, had made a statement on the organization of the hearing. He repeated that he too believed it would be desirable for a member of the US Congress to take part.

Mr GIBBONS (Democrat, Florida) apologized for the absence of Mr FRASER, co-chairman of the Joint Working Party, who was unable to attend because he was standing for election to the Senate. On the subject of the hearing on Argentina, he asked that a letter be sent to Mr FRASER asking him to propose a member of Congress who might take part in it.

As for the choice of Argentina for this hearing, he pointed out that serious violations of human rights were being perpetrated in various parts of the world, for example, in Cuba, Indonesia and in the Philippines. They also merited attention. However, a start had to be made somewhere and the choice of Argentina seemed acceptable.

Mr GIBBONS drew attention to the kidnapping of politicians, a serious issue which the working party might also look into.

Mr COUSTE said that he would send a letter to Mr FRASER asking him to send one or more members of Congress to the hearing on Argentina.

On the subject of the hearing on Argentina, Miss FLESCH felt it was desirable not to mix sport and politics. The working party should confine itself to investigating the human rights situation in that country with a view to improving the position of Argentinian citizens and to safeguarding the security of people visiting Argentina.

As regards the relations of the European Community with the associated countries, Miss FLESCH stressed that, while respecting the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, it was necessary to intervene to safeguard the physical integrity of individuals. The European Parliament wanted the next Convention to include a clause relating to the safeguarding of human rights. This desire had been expressed at the last two meetings with the members of parliament of the associated countries and had been favourably received. The ministers of those countries, on the other hand, had been doubtful about this and had invoked the non-interference clause.

Miss FLESCH pointed out that in its memorandum on the negotiations on the new Convention, the Commission had, albeit cautiously, raised the issue of the protection of fundamental human rights.

The European Parliament was obviously not prepared to accept a compromise in this area.

Mr SCELBA said that only democratic regimes were able to guarantee respect for fundamental rights. A global policy should be pursued in this area. It would clearly be wrong to attack the Argentine regime, for example, without also condemning the more serious violations being committed in other countries, such as Cambodia, Vietnam and the Soviet Union.

Moreover, to protect the rights of the individual it was necessary to suspend all aid to countries which violated them. For example, it was not logical to grant preferential treatment to East Germany while that country failed to respect human rights, in particular the right to family reunification.

Mr COUSTE said that the question of a global approach had not been ignored by the Political Affairs Committee of the European Parliament, which was going to look into the situation of Jews in the Soviet Union.

Mr GIBBONS announced that a member of the working party, Mr CORMAN, member of the Judicial Committee of the US House of Representatives, had been involved in the preparation of the Civil Rights Act in the United States and that he was an expert in the protection of human rights by legal means.

Mr CORMAN (Democrat, California) said that no country was blameless in this respect. Violations of human rights were being committed throughout the world. We should therefore be ready to accept criticisms from other countries; sovereignty did not confer absolute rights. When he launched his human rights campaign, President CARTER was undoubtedly also bearing in mind the human rights situation in the United States.

It was necessary to agree on principles and on the definition of human rights. To protect these rights it was essential to consolidate relations between states in this area.

Mr DELMOTTE drew attention to the point made by Mr GLINNE on the subject of human rights in connection with the Convention of Lomé. Occasional interventions were not enough. While three countries - Greece, Portugal and Spain - had returned to democratic forms of government, other had fallen under oppressive regimes. Only 26 of the world's countries had democratic governments.

It was necessary to establish criteria on the basis of the two principles mentioned by Mr CORMAN, i.e. that sovereignty did not confer absolute rights and that inter-state relations must be promoted.

It was up to the Members of Parliament to bring pressure to bear on the executive authorities in order to ensure that the rights of the individual were respected.

Mr MCDONALD shared Mr SCELBA's opinion that a global policy was needed. Clearly, account also had to be taken of violations committed in our own countries and of the increasing threat posed by terrorists. In this context efforts should be based on the work carried out by non-government organizations which concerned themselves with human rights, Amnesty International in particular.

He felt that the Political Affairs Committee of the European Parliament should, at an early opportunity, look into the question of kidnappings, especially those of a political nature.

Mr LOTT (Republican, Mississippi) felt it was necessary to define clearly the rights to be protected. It was doubtless useful to organize hearings, carry out investigations and issue declarations, provided that politically cautious methods were used.

In the case of Argentina, it was indeed important to be careful not to mix sport and human rights.

Mr JAHN noted that it had not hitherto been easy to get the two delegations to pay adequate attention to the question of human rights. This had now been achieved, however, thanks in particular to the working party of which Mr COUSTE was chairman.

At the Belgrade Conference the representatives of the nine Member States of the Community and other countries with which it had friendly relations had shown a united front on the issue of the protection of human rights. Now that that Conference had been concluded it was important not to relent; on the contrary, these problems needed to be kept under constant observation until the next meeting in Madrid. There should be discussion of the problem of human rights in general, the problems of Jews in the Soviet Union and the situation of millions of Germans in the Eastern bloc countries.

Replying to Mr LOTT and others, Mr PRESCOTT said it was sometimes difficult to distinguish clearly between sport and human rights since sport was often used for political ends. This was the case in Hitler's Germany in 1936 and it was the case in Argentina today. The important thing was to prevent the Argentine regime from exploiting the World Cup for political ends.

Moreover, it was impossible to protect all human rights without exception. But what could be done was to try to ensure that fundamental rights were respected in all countries.

Pressure to achieve this end might be applied through economic aid and not solely through military aid. It was also important, however, not to overlook violations committed in our own countries.

Mr WINN agreed with Mr PRESCOTT that it was occasionally a good thing to look at oneself in a mirror. In addition, he said that at the last conference of American states Mr VANCE had stressed that henceforth American economic and military aid would be subject to respect for human rights.

Mr COUSTE informed the working party that the results of their deliberations would be presented the following day to the two delegations at their plenary sitting.

2.3 Working Group on energy

The meeting opened at 2.30 p.m. with the chairman, Mr SCOTT-HOPKINS in the chair.

Mr LEONARDI explained the main points of his document 'General aspects of Community energy policy' (PE 52.717).

He said that, in spite of the targets set in 1974, the Community's dependence on imported energy had remained greater than forecast because of the small number of nuclear power stations built. He mentioned the need to inform public opinion about the risk involved in an irrational development of nuclear energy but it should not be forgotten either that any decision to halt nuclear development would have extremely serious political and economic consequences.

As a result of opposition to nuclear power stations, nuclear programmes had fallen a long way behind schedule. Four years ago, the Community's nuclear capacity in 1985 was estimated at 200 gigawatts, subsequently reduced to 160 gigawatts. Present estimates put the figure at barely 90 gigawatts.

Mr LEONARDI also felt that the present uncertainty, disequilibrium and tension in the world was due to the continuing rise in oil prices and the state of almost complete dependence on the oil-producing countries.

This uncertainty seriously disturbed international relations, slowed down economic development, particularly in the Community, and had serious repercussions on the social sector, the balance of payments and employment.

Mr MARTIN (Republican, North Carolina) discussed the general aspects of United States energy policy and its repercussions on the economic policies of the Member States of the Community¹.

He stressed the need for the United States to achieve energy savings of at least 2%, as laid down in President Carter's programme. As matters stood, however, the rate of present consumption required a steady rise in oil imports, now running at between 8 and 9 billion barrels a day. Mr Martin also said that a policy based solely on savings could have the unwanted side-effect of reducing many people's standard of living.

He felt that the United States would have to make greater use of its own energy resources.

¹ PE 53.125

On this point he examined four main areas of US energy policy:

- (1) Electricity production from nuclear energy. This choice was inevitable even if certain risks were involved. 68 lightwater reactors were in commission at present and the number might rise to 200 by the year 2000;
- (2) Coal. Major incentives would be given to the production of fossil fuels, of which the US had particularly rich deposits; technologies would be developed for gasification as in Europe; however, exploitation of this very important and abundant source of energy supply did carry certain environmental risks;
- (3) Oil and natural gas. It had been predicted that, at the present rate of consumption, this third source of supply would be exhausted within thirty or forty years;
- (4) Solar and geothermal energy. Great importance was attached to these two sources of unlimited and pollution-free energy. Large-scale research and development programmes had been put in hand and a certain percentage of energy needs could be met from these sources (in the year 2000, a saving of 5 million barrels oil equivalent) particularly if the price of solar collectors were to go down.

In conclusion, Mr MARTIN pointed to the inevitable need to use nuclear energy until such time as science and technology made other less dangerous and less polluting energy available. He felt that there were serious hazards involved in the disposal of radioactive waste until vitrification became a viable technology some time in the near future.

Mrs WALZ introduced her document PE 52.690, pointing out that the spread of nuclear weapons and their control was a serious problem which all Europeans shared and that it had to be resolved at international level.

However, it did raise a number of political and economic problems which had to be considered. The Community was not in the same position as the United States which possessed abundant resources of its own.

The Community was consequently in a more vulnerable position. According to forecasts which had been confirmed by experts at the Xth World Energy Conference in Istanbul, energy supplies were likely to decline appreciably, causing a steady rise in prices, despite the availability of coal and North Sea oil. For these reasons recourse to nuclear energy was unavoidable if the Community was to reduce its energy dependence. This justified its strategy on reprocessing nuclear fuel, its plan of action on radioactive waste and its decision to develop fast-breeder reactors.

Given the need for alternative energy sources, there was no other choice than nuclear energy as it would in the not-too-distant future make a considerable contribution to the Community's energy supplies.

The fullest precautions would nevertheless have to be taken to ensure that this option was as safe as possible and introduced on no larger a scale than was necessary.

Finally, Mrs WALZ made the point that since uranium supplies were limited, greater efforts would have to be made to build fast-breeder reactors which were capable of producing 60 times more energy than conventional thermal reactors.

Mr RYAN, co-chairman, speaking on his document PE 52.841, said that there was simply not enough information available on the problems and costs of managing radioactive waste and decommissioning nuclear power stations.

He went on to say that these problems should be given serious consideration. The dream of electricity too cheap to meter, which had spurred industrial expansion and the bold planning of the 1960s had evaporated as electricity companies were now forecasting a cost price of approximately \$1,000 per kilowatt.

Mr RYAN then spoke on the final storage and management of radioactive waste. He said that definitive measures had never been taken on storage, and that there were radioactive isotopes which would continue to emit hazardous levels of radiation for more than 1 million years. Even if the question of the management of these wastes in the United States seemed to have been practically resolved, more was being stockpiled every day. Both Americans and Europeans ought to reflect and take a much more cautious attitude on all of these problems.

This did not mean that nuclear programmes should be abandoned even if there were difficulties in having nuclear energy accepted by the public.

However, greater attention had to be given to the other alternative energy sources, particularly solar energy, which would be the only one available to us in the future and therefore every effort should be made to develop the commercial use of this renewable source.

Mr BANGEMANN, however, speaking on the general objectives of the common energy policy, said that the nuclear option was the most promising form of alternative energy even though it required considerable investment and more stringent safety measures.

On the subject of the non-proliferation treaty on nuclear weapons, he said that this was a political and international problem.

While conceding that the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons was an important factor in the review of the treaty, Mr BANGEMANN said that it was wrong and absurd to believe that the spread of nuclear weapons could be stopped by slowing down nuclear development for peaceful use. He added that the consequences of holding up the peaceful application of nuclear energy would be most keenly felt in those countries which had already signed the non-proliferation treaty since it was today their only serious alternative energy source to oil.

Mr POWER, although favouring the nuclear option as the only means of reducing dependence on oil producing countries, said that we were in the same position of dependence for our uranium supplies.

Nevertheless it should be brought home to the general public that there was more to be said for than against the development of nuclear energy.

In conclusion, Mr POWER proposed that research and development into alternative energy resources should be continued even if it required massive capital investment.

Mr HAASE drew attention to the alarming balance-of-payments deficits and state of social crisis both in the United States and in Europe, both of which were the result of heavy dependence on the rest of the world for energy supplies.

He said that although much had already been done to reduce waste and to promote research and development programmes into nuclear energy and other alternative sources, the present world imbalance was due principally to the economic instability of the United States.

In his opinion, relations between the United States and Europe could improve only if agreement was reached on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and a fair distribution of world energy resources.

Mr FLAMIG said that, although they agreed on energy saving measures, the two sides did not see eye to eye on the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

While the United States did not yet have a plan of action on the reprocessing of fuel and the management of radioactive waste, Europe had taken the decision to develop and follow up new energy options. The Community had adopted a nuclear strategy relating to radioactive wastes, fuel reprocessing and ~~fast~~-breeder reactors.

Considerable progress had in fact been made on the management of radioactive waste through research and development programmes and the creation of a Community network of storage sites.

In conclusion, Mr FLAMIG pointed to the dangers of recent American legislation which he felt would induce other countries to pursue national policies. Because of its complexities and implications, nuclear policy could not be conducted on purely national lines.

Mr FITHIAN emphasized the political significance of the recent adoption in Washington of the bill on nuclear non-proliferation.

He said that the American call for a moratorium of 24 months, excluding some European countries which are not members of the nuclear club, would enable nuclear fuel reprocessing technology to be developed and improved, thereby checking the spread of nuclear weapons. He added that this legislation would no longer be effective once the required level of technical knowledge had been reached.

Mr FITHIAN although he agreed that distinguished scientists had made progress in this field, felt that plutonium was a dangerous fuel.

He drew attention to U.S. concern about the storage of radioactive waste since there was still some uncertainty surrounding the technique of vitrification and research into final storage in salt-mines, although work in this field had been going on for quite some time.

He agreed, however, that the Euratom surveillance system was considerably more effective than the AIEA protection standards and that Europe had acquired a lead in the reprocessing sector.

Mr FITHIAN concluded by saying that these two years for reflection would allow Europeans to draw up their own policy on proliferation.

Mr BROWN recalled his criticisms during the 1960s of the US light water reactor design, which was subsequently found to be imperfect giving low capacity utilization. He feared similar problems if Europe was to be diverted by US pressure from its present views on developments in nuclear power. Other alternative sources such as solar and geothermal energy would, according to forecasts, meet only 5% of energy demand in 2000; nuclear power was vital therefore. He criticized in some detail the US Non-Proliferation Act which he said seriously threatened EC uranium supplies, as well as EC development of enrichment processing and fast breeder reactors. He was opposed to any renegotiation of the US-Euratom Treaty.

Mr RYAN, in his reply, re-emphasized the problem of the cost of nuclear energy. He said that 30 years after the introduction of nuclear energy, American experts were beginning to look seriously at the cost of decommissioning power stations and storing millions of tons of nuclear waste. He referred to the problem of the plutonium produced in nuclear power stations, concluding that until this problem was solved, it would remain a threat to public safety.

Mr RIPAMONTI immediately pointed out that in view of the policy of deferring to some unspecified date the problem of reprocessing and plutonium recycling, restructuring of the United States programme on fast-breeder reactors and the postponement of the date by which these reactors could be introduced into commercial service and the vagueness of the programme for the final storage of radioactive waste, it could be said that President Carter's plan for the development of nuclear energy in the United States and in the world was extremely vague and uncertain. It seemed to have a mainly unfavourable effect on the Community's energy prospects.

Mr RIPAMONTI emphasized the need to develop fast-breeder reactors and the effects which this development would have on the Community's future energy supplies. There were, in fact differences between nuclear development based on fast reactors (European options) and that based exclusively on light water reactors until 2020 as in President Carter's plan. Reputed experts have said that the development of fast-breeder reactors should not be delayed beyond the year 2000 so as not to threaten the precarious balance between demand and supply. A delay of 10 years would be enough to create a situation of instability in uranium prices with the possibility of sharp increases neutralizing the competitiveness of this technology.

In conclusion, Mr RIPAMONTI repeated that the problem was really a political one. The Carter plan was based on optimistic scientific evaluations. It was favourable to the United States which had already found adequate uranium reserves to maintain a programme based on light water reactors until at least 2020. It was less favourable to Europe which favoured the development of fast-breeder reactors and reprocessing.

Mr MARTIN answered some of the questions that had been raised. He was of the opinion that not much progress had been made in vitrification and hence the problem of waste was crucial. He agreed on the need to make savings, reduce waste and promote new systems of thermal insulation. Oil had remained in plentiful supply but the rise in prices had had and would continue to have a very serious impact on the balance of payments. He also said that it was not only nuclear energy that was expensive; the new energy sources would also require huge investment.

Mr LEONARDI again made the point that the rise in American oil imports was one of the principal causes of the fall in the dollar and this had adverse consequences on Europe's trade position, thus frustrating the objectives of the EEC and preventing its development. He concluded by saying that the non-proliferation problem should be settled between Europe and the United States in a spirit of cooperation, making allowance for the comprehensive safety guarantees offered by EURATOM.

Mr FITHIAN insisted once again that President Carter's nuclear policy based on the development of light water reactors was the right one. He maintained that this option would prove worthwhile if the time needed to build this type of reactor could be reduced and the associated technologies improved.

Mrs WALZ wound up the proceedings with the following questions:

- (a) Why was unilateral legislation enacted by the US Congress instead of there being an examination of the possibilities under the Non-Proliferation Treaty of jointly deliberating on these questions in two years time?

Why is there a de facto termination of the US-EURATOM agreement which concerns, inter alia, uranium supplies until 1990? International agreements must be respected or there must be joint deliberations.

- (b) Are the Member States of the Community treated as a single unit?
- (c) Exceptional authorization has been granted in respect of the agreements in force, which have been renewed for one year by the President, but they may also be terminated by Congress. What steps can be taken to achieve other alternatives, within two years, for example by conversion to thorium? Such conversions require 20 years. How long can the oil market hold out until it is completely exhausted? And which national economies must still go under because of oil prices, as is already happening today in the case of a good many developing countries.
- (d) Enrichment plants exploited on a commercial basis must be allowed to continue functioning but this only applies to la Hague, and not to Windscale or Almelo. Would the Americans be able to use only the one at la Hague?

2.4 Working Group on Economic Issues

The chairman, Mr GIBBONS, explained that most of the economic difficulties of the United States stemmed from their oil imports, which totalled 45,000 million dollars and represented about half of their consumption. In addition to this, petrol prices were relatively low owing to the low level of tax on this product. This had all led to a trade deficit of about 20,000 million dollars, which was the main cause of the depreciation of the dollar. He added that there was little the United States could do to stabilize the dollar. Mr GIBBONS also said that he was not particularly pleased with the progress of the multilateral negotiations within GATT. He felt that greater attention should be paid to non-tariff barriers and in that connection alluded to the 'Zenith' case which was currently before the American Supreme Court. The US Steel Corporation had also brought a similar action. If the Supreme Court were to uphold these demands international trade would be plunged into chaos. Finally, Mr GIBBONS criticized the special relations between the Community and its former colonies. In his view these relations should be based on the most-favoured nation clause.

Mr HAASE pointed out that the effects of the fall of the dollar were much more serious in Europe than in the United States because the American internal market was much bigger. This meant that the present monetary difficulties - with the exception of oil imports - did not play such a crucial role in external trade. In this connection he drew attention to the fact that one-third of OPEC production was bought by the United States and asked whether the United States was willing to accept further price increases, which would entail a further worsening of their balance of payments situation. The European countries were having to cope with a dollar surplus and as a result the whole monetary system was being called into question in Europe. The importation of capital into the United States lagged behind the exportation of capital and the American trade deficit, and its capital exports, were in fact being partly financed by Europe. The decline in confidence in the dollar might also have certain political consequences. Mr HAASE admitted, however, that the Europeans were also to blame and argued in favour of the United Kingdom, France and Italy joining the currency snake. This would compel the countries with strong currencies to help the weak European currencies and this would help Europe better to withstand the assault on the dollar. In the last few months the Bundesbank had bought 13,000 million dollars. Mr HAASE also advocated an increase in interest rates in the US and drew attention to the creation of money in the private sector (short and medium-term credit by private undertakings to the developing countries and poor industrialized countries). Finally he expressed the view that, pursuant to the principle of free trade,

it was not possible to isolate Japan; that country had in fact already shown a certain amount of goodwill in the monetary and commercial sphere.

Mr COUSTE expressed concern at the fact that the agreement to be reached during the Tokyo Round had to be approved by the US Congress on the basis of the Trade Act; the outcome was therefore extremely uncertain. He agreed with Mr HAASE that the multilateral negotiations had been completely dominated by monetary issues. He also raised the question whether the Americans intended to abolish DISC (Domestic International Sales Corporation) which had been condemned by GATT. He also asked whether the American Selling Price (ASP) would be maintained. He wished to be told what the United States' attitude was towards the safeguard clause provided in Article 9 of GATT. Finally, Mr COUSTE suggested that Japanese representatives should also be invited to the next meeting in the United States.

Mr PRESCOTT stressed the interdependence between the various economic sectors, monetary issues, the multilateral negotiations, agricultural policy and relations with the developing countries. Bilateral agreements between Europe and America alone could not provide solutions to all these problems. The role of the third world in the multilateral negotiations would prove to be of the utmost importance. The economic development of those countries was an inescapable reality which would have to be accepted by the industrialized countries, even if it had an adverse effect on their own employment situations. The United States would also become steadily more dependent on the third world. He pointed out that the third world accounted for 48% of the world's population but controlled only 18% of world trade; the relevant figures for the rich countries were 20% and 71% respectively.

In reply to the questions put by Mr COUSTE, Mr GIBBONS said it was obvious that the United States could expect reprisals if the agreements reached during the Tokyo Round were rejected by Congress. In addition, he was opposed to DISC and ASP but, invoking Article 19 of GATT, expressed for a solution based on the most-favoured nation clause.

Thursday, 30 March 1978

Second Plenary Session

During dinner on 29 March 1978 Mr RYAN, chairman of the US Congress delegation, proposed that future meetings of delegations in the United States take place in cities other than Washington DC. In introducing the second plenary session Mr RYAN pointed out the logistical problems that holding such a meeting outside Washington would pose. He hoped nevertheless that it would be possible to hold the 14th meeting in California, given time for preparation. He proposed that a joint committee be set up to work on this matter, with Mr ZAGARI as ad hoc committee chairman. The objective of the committee would be to work out arrangements required by the European Parliament delegation, drawing on the services of the two secretariats where necessary. He hoped that the committee might draw up proposals concerning the next meeting including its date. He suggested that mid-November would be most suitable for many members of the US Congress.

2.5. Economic issues

Introducing his working document¹, Mr SCOTT-HOPKINS pointed out that in the agricultural sphere there were serious problems between the Community and the United States. On the one hand the United States wanted to boost their cereals exports but at the same time they had adopted restrictive policies towards imports of milk products from the Community. He said that the common agricultural policy would not be fundamentally changed. But if the United States adopted a flexible approach the Community's policy with regard to export refunds in respect of milk products could certainly be reviewed. At all events it was clear that trade in this area needed to be liberalized. He reminded the participants of the difficulties which had occurred in the past in connection with soya bean exports and drew attention to the surpluses in the wine sector. Finally he commented that the agricultural sector must not be tackled as a separate question in international discussions such as the GATT negotiations.

Introducing his working document², Mr FITHIAN said that the United States was aware of the fact that the Community represented a large market for their agricultural products. Nevertheless American farmers were currently in the throes of a serious crisis since their purchasing power was lower than it had been at any time since the 1930s. The United States needed to export one-third of its agricultural products and Agricultural Secretary Bergland was opposed to export restrictions. Mr FITHIAN felt, however, that something should be done to improve the quality of products. He expected prices to rise in the future because at the moment they were in many cases lower than production costs. As regards talks within GATT he felt that the industrial questions and those relating to agriculture should be considered at the same time. In this connection the exportation of cereals and the importation of milk products were crucial issues. He also felt that it was of the utmost importance that the negotiations be completed by the middle of July since present American legislation could not permit them to go on indefinitely. If the negotiations were to be successful it was vital that a compromise be reached in the agricultural sector. In conclusion Mr FITHIAN commented that the difficulties between Europe and the United States might be somewhat alleviated if the latter looked for other markets. Measures along these lines were in preparation. America and Europe could not afford the luxury of a trade war.

¹ PE 52.749

² PE 53.126

Mr BAAS said that American farmers had suffered substantial losses as a result of the depreciation of the dollar. The state of American agriculture was indeed very serious.

Nevertheless, the United States needed to realize that the importation of milk products from the Community was a *conditio sine qua non* of the success of the Tokyo Round, and he advocated a bilateral discussion of these issues between the United States and Europe. If no agreement were reached the Community would be compelled to impose import duties on soya beans. The success of the Tokyo Round depended on a bilateral agreement between the US and Europe.

Mr FITHIAN pointed out, for the record, that he did not personally agree with the last passage of the note drawn up by Mr NOLAN and himself.

Mr JOHNSON felt that the Community's demands were not realistic. It was not reasonable to expect any country, for whatever product, voluntarily to give up its independence. Farmers were already getting rid of their ranches. However the United States was importing meat despite the fact that it already produced more than it could consume. The US was also giving substantial aid to the third world in the meat sector.

Mr RYAN said that the wine Industry in California had expanded considerably in recent years and that it had become necessary to export certain quantities of this product. Europe was not, however, a particularly accessible market for wine.

Referring to Mr JOHNSON's statement, Mr SCOTT-HOPKINS said that prices were lower than production costs in the United Kingdom too. Moreover, the Community had in a number of cases agreed to become dependent on imports from abroad, for example in the sugar sector.

Mr MCDONALD drew attention to the present uncertainties with regard to the supply of protein products as a result of which price fluctuations had occurred in the feedingstuffs sector.

According to Mr PRESCOTT the rich countries would find it increasingly necessary to sacrifice jobs in the interests of the third world. How this was to be done was a point which could be thrown open to discussion but that this would happen was inevitable. New political trends were to be expected which would strongly influence international economic relations. At present the third world, with 40% of the world's population, had only an 18% share of world trade and 7% of industrial production. That was why the income disparity between the rich countries and the poor countries was getting increasingly greater. A full review of economic relations in the world was unavoidable. In the United Nations the objective had already been set of raising the third world's share of industrial production to

25% in the next 40 years. Mr PRESCOTT pointed out that the various economic sectors were interdependent and that therefore the effects of any changes would be felt in every sector.

The policies of industrialized countries must be geared to increasing the third world's share of the world economy and at the same time maintaining a certain amount of order in trade relations. People were aware of this in Europe as was evidenced in the talks going on in the textile, steel and shipbuilding industries. The problems with which we were faced could not be solved within GATT alone. First of all, the monetary problems, which were having dire consequences for the third world, should be tackled. The dependence of our countries, including the US, on the third world would continue to increase in the future.

Mr HAASE felt that it was not a good idea to lump together all the various issues in an unmanageable package. On the contrary, the various problems should be tackled individually and if possible solutions found for each of them. He also stressed that the Community and the United States should adopt a joint approach to the various questions because their interests coincided in many respects.

Referring to the comments made by Mr JOHNSON, Mr LEONARDI said that the Community was far more dependent than the US on other countries. This dependence was hampering progress towards economic and political integration.

In his view the Community should strive to achieve the greatest possible degree of autonomy and to achieve this oil imports should be reduced. Finally, he said that the situation of the dollar, which had had dire consequences for Europe, could not be allowed to continue.

Mr POWER said he was disappointed at the American attitude which he felt could lead to a trade war. He referred to the difficulties occurring in connection with beef and veal exports from Ireland to the United States.

Mr COUSTE felt that excessive pessimism was not justified. He said that despite the difficulties of 1973 progress had been made in world trade. At the same time he realized that the difficulties arising in connection with the dollar tended to favour the United States at the present time so that it could not be expected to produce solutions to this problem. Industrialized countries should join forces in order to find solutions to these problems; the finding of solutions was in the interests of the developing countries too. He expressed concern about the attitude which Congress would be adopting with regard to the results achieved during the GATT negotiations. There was greater general awareness of economic reality than was commonly believed. An example of this was the Multifibre Arrangement. Nevertheless, discussion at world level remained an absolute must.

Mr Geoffrey RIPPON agreed with most of the comments made by Mr PRESCOTT. The developing countries would indeed be demanding a greater share in world trade. As far as the difficulties in the milk sector were concerned, he said that the Community was an even worse offender than the United States since it had imposed severe restrictions on imports of these products from New Zealand. In conclusion he expressed the view that if a sort of mini-Marshall plan were to be adopted for the Mediterranean areas this should be - and this was also the wish of the United States - an exclusively European operation.

Mr RIPAMONTI discussed monetary difficulties¹. He hoped that the Americans would start reducing their oil imports - the principal cause of their balance of payments deficit - as soon as possible. If the OPEC countries were compelled by the depreciation of the dollar to decide to increase oil prices the dollar would be brought under even greater pressure. The American Government's plans to introduce tax cuts in order to stimulate economic growth were causing confusion in Europe against the background of the American aim of bringing the Federal budget into balance in 1981. He summarized certain other causes of the US balance of payments deficit and asked whether the Americans were seeking to strengthen their export position by allowing the dollar to depreciate. He then suggested various methods for solving this problem. Finally, he pointed out that the dollar crisis might have a harmful influence on the progress of the Tokyo Round.

¹ PE 52.795

Third Plenary Session

2.6 Report from Working Group on Energy

Following a brief break Mr GIBBONS, co-chairman, introduced Mr MARTIN who briefly summarized the discussion in the Working Group on Energy. He commented that the absolute unity shown by European delegates on nuclear power, the recovery and re-use of nuclear fuel, had impressed the US delegation. He alluded to the contributions of Mrs WALZ and Mr LEONARDI and briefly summarized his own contribution. He underlined that current legislation in Congress which stressed energy conservation would not alone solve the problem of major imports of fuel into the US. He alluded to the risks of nuclear power but contrasted these with the sometimes unrecognized risks of greater reliance on coal. He recalled Mr RYAN's speech in which he expressed his concern over the great and unpredictable costs of nuclear power, and in which he advised European colleagues to study this issue more carefully. Mr BROWN had cited the somewhat unfortunate persuasion of Europe by the United States Atomic Energy Committee some 10 years ago to accept light water reactors which had been found subsequently to have had greater risks. Both Mr BROWN and Mr HAASE had objected strenuously to the Non-Proliferation Act, which restricted the recovery and re-use of fissionable waste. Mr RIPAMONTI had emphasized the need for technological continuity and Mr POWER had suggested the United States reduce their consumption through greater energy efficiency. Mr MARTIN then concluded his brief review by examining more carefully the views on the Non-Proliferation Act.

Mr SCOTT-HOPKINS emphasized the controversy that had taken place over the Non-Proliferation Act passed by the US Congress. He reminded the members of the questions that Mrs WALZ had asked at the end of the session on the effect of the Non-Proliferation Act on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, on why there was a need to renegotiate the Euratom Treaty which continues to 1990, and what alternatives existed to the EC's nuclear policy. He stressed that all participants agreed that an energy gap would exist in both Europe and the United States and that the nuclear alternative was one way of filling the gap. Despite the re-assuring construction of the Non-Proliferation Act given by Mr FITHIAN several speakers, particularly Mr BROWN, had hotly challenged this. Mr SCOTT-HOPKINS emphasized Mr RIPAMONTI's point that a two year delay was unrealistic. He concluded by saying that the meeting generally agreed that the next discussion should concentrate on the questions of waste disposal, safeguards, and also the implications of the Non-Proliferation Act.

Both Mr MARTIN and Mr GIBBONS suggested that there was a need to think of ways of preventing the US Congress legislating without consultation with colleagues in other countries.

2.7. Report of the proceedings of the Joint Working Group on Human Rights

Mr COUSTE summarized the proceedings of the previous day. He noted that the speakers had emphasized the following points which underlay any human rights policy:

- the universality of the problem;
- the need for objectivity whatever the regime;
- support, on the basis of these criteria, for independent human rights organizations such as Amnesty International;
- the usefulness in most cases of widely publicizing violations of human rights;
- the need to exert pressure on any state having signed international acts on human rights;

The working group had taken note of Mr COUSTE's working document in which he urged parliamentary representatives to adopt a concentrated approach towards fundamental rights, no violation of which could be tolerated. The working group intended to express its views regularly whenever repeated and systematic violations were brought to its attention.

Mr GIBBONS and others had stressed the right not to be kidnapped, particularly for political reasons, and alluded to the legitimate protests by peoples and political organizations throughout the world against such kidnappings.

Mr PRESCOTT had announced that the Political Affairs Committee was to hold a public hearing (subject to the Bureau's authorization) on certain violations of human rights in Argentina on the basis of his information note. He had, in particular, stressed the value of US participation at this hearing. Mr GIBBONS had proposed that Mr COUSTE write to Mr FRASER asking him to appoint a member of his subcommittee to take part in the hearing.

Miss FLESCH had presented her working document on human rights and Lomé II. She had stressed the desire of both the Consultative Assembly and the Commission to introduce the principle of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms into the new Convention and had mentioned the evasive answer of the Council of Foreign Ministers. The memorandum proposed that a precise reference to the most fundamental rights should be included. The Commission also reserved the right to condemn publicly violations of the objectives thus defined and to adopt special measures as regards aid to any ACP States concerned.

Mr COUSTE had referred to the following possibilities, proposals and recommendations:

- (a) the resolve to continue joint emergency interventions on behalf of the working group and the exchange of views held on this subject;
- (b) the preparation of an annual report on the human rights situation in the world for the use of parliamentarians (based on the ad hoc reports of the US Congress and other reports by Amnesty International);
- (c) the suggestion that a half-day meeting of the joint working group be convened before or after the next interparliamentary meeting;
- (d) the need for extremely thorough legal studies by the relevant departments of the two parliaments on:
 - 1. the changing relationship between the doctrine of non-interference in internal affairs and the concept of universal human rights;
 - 2. the practical principles and possible extension of the right to political asylum and the reception of exiles and refugees. In this connection the Executive Committee of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees had requested that the principle of the rights to asylum, the right not to be turned away and the right to refugee status be reinforced;
 - 3. the legal impact of the international campaign for the abolition of capital punishment which was regarded as a degrading and inhuman punishment.

2.8 Final comments and proposals

Mr HAASE, taking up the proposal of Mr RYAN, suggested that at the next meeting which might be in California, members of the Japanese Diet be invited to participate in a trilateral discussion.

Mr BANGEMANN took Mr HAASE's and Mr RYAN's propositions further, and suggested that an arrangements committee should be set up, not solely concerned with the technical and logistical preparations for the meeting but also with the kind of issues raised by Mr HAASE, and to review the experiences of the meetings so far, so that proposals for streamlining and improving them might be drawn up. He recalled that Ambassador SCHAEZEL, past US Ambassador to the European Communities, had views concerning US Congress-EP relations. Mr BANGEMANN suggested that Mr SCHAEZEL might be invited to a meeting of this arrangements committee, to discuss such views. He remarked that if there were similar European experts they might be invited also. In the month before the meetings a paper concerning future proposals could be drawn up and discussed together. Mr GIBBONS approved of this suggestion, which he felt could help make the meetings even more productive than they currently were. He also commented that the Lange/Gibbons Code of Conduct, which had been introduced into the US Congress as a bill, was slowly making its way through Congress.

2.9 Co-chairmen's conclusions

Mr ZAGARI concluded the meeting by underlining major themes of the discussions in the previous two days. We were living in an age which needed a greater measure of stabilization. Dramatic events were occurring in Europe and in the Mediterranean area. While the United States, united in its language and its currency was better able because of that to face up to the instability than the European Community, which was not even united in those two respects, he hoped that direct elections to the European Parliament might increase the move towards unity and wondered whether another Messina Conference was needed. The need for unity was especially great in order to fight together the monsters of inflation and unemployment, and to tackle the major issues provoked by the forthcoming enlargement of the European Community, which should help to bolster democracy in the Mediterranean. The full political implications of this enlargement, the movement of the political axis towards the south, had not been yet appreciated. He alluded to Mr PRESCOTT's dramatic description of the new priorities required in north/south relations and commented that these provoked a new assessment of international trade worldwide.

He fully welcomed Mr RYAN's proposal that the meetings in the United States take place outside Washington, since neither side knew each other very well. He hoped that the next meeting might take place in California, following the American co-chairman's repeated invitation. Mr ZAGARI considered that our historic task of the moment was to further extend democratic areas of the world. The discussions on energy, on economic and international trade pointed out that we had to recognize our sins of protectionism and obsessive materialism. This recognition gave further emphasis to the need for a review of EC and US relations with the third world. The Mediterranean area was where both Europe and Africa met and indicated the complementarity of these two partners. Mr ZAGARI concluded his speech by calling for a global approach to US/EC relations.

In taking his leave Mr ZAGARI asked both Mr COUSTE to replace him for the other engagements on Thursday, and Mr FAURE for the meeting in Palermo.

Friday, 31 March 1978

3. MEETING IN PALERMO

Mr DE PASQUALE, President of the Sicilian Parliament, welcomed the members of the two delegations to Palermo. He explained that Sicily firmly believed in a united Europe, and in political and economic integration. In view of the coming enlargement to include three countries of the Mediterranean he expected that Sicily would play a larger role in the movement towards unity, and in the contacts between the European Community and the third world. He looked forward to a Community which had overcome national egoism and which was founded on international cooperation.

Mr MATTARELLA, President of the government of the autonomous Sicilian region, welcomed the members of the delegations to Palermo and to the Mediterranean area. He stressed the vital need for unity in Europe, in the face of terrorism that threatened democracy. He explained that a set of new ideals needed to be agreed for Europe, and particularly for the young.

Turning to the major issues of enlargement and of direct elections, Mr MATTARELLA commented that Sicily had fought for direct elections to take place as quickly as possible, and looked forward to the enlargement of the Community to include Greece, Portugal and Spain. He recognised, however, that the problems of southern Italy and southern France could be made more worse on enlargement, if specific measures were not taken to avoid this.

He continued by pointing out the importance that Sicily's position in Europe had for Europe's relations with Africa. He explained that Sicily had so far been unable to play its full part in Europe's unification, but with the new grouping of political forces in Italy he hoped that it would be able to do so.

He recognised that the major interest of the European Community was both democratic stability and international cooperation. In Sicily the development of Europe was more than ever important. It was the bridge between Europe and Africa, the vehicle for the dialogue which had been started, but seems so far to have side-stepped Sicily. He appealed for greater efforts to work against the widening rift where the rich were getting richer in the European Community at the expense of the poor regions. The economic situation in Sicily was not particularly satisfactory, though with the new regional government plans and programmes, some hope existed for its amelioration.

Mr MATTARELLA mentioned the major threat to the democratic order that the kidnapping of Mr Aldo Moro constituted.

Mr FAURE expressed the Community's solidarity with the democracy of Italy during its current suffering. Turning to Community affairs he reminded the audience that many Community policies were far from being universally supported and that the movement towards European union depended upon the agreement of such policies. He concluded by emphasizing that the building of a healthy and united Community implied as a necessary condition its continued support for democratic ways.

For his part Mr WINN underlined the similarity of the problems facing the United States and those facing the Community at the present time. He emphasized the necessity of consultation and common approaches in the resolution of these problems, particularly for the serious economic questions that were currently being discussed in the multilateral trade negotiations. Recalling a question posed to the US Congress delegation during their meeting in Taormina, Mr WINN said that more and more the United States were considering Europe as one unit, though in many areas there were still nine separate views. He hoped for a further movement towards unity.

The European Federalist Movement and the European Committee of Palermo presented a petition to the delegations calling for an acceleration of the process of European integration.

Address given by Mr Emilio COLOMBO, the President of the European Parliament,
at the dinner in the Hotel Capotaormina on Wednesday, 29 March 1978

Chairman RYAN, honourable Members, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a great honour for me to welcome you, Congressman RYAN, and your delegation to Sicily, to part of Mediterranean Europe. This is the second time that I have had this pleasure, and I believe it will give you another opportunity of seeing the great variety that there is in Europe - for the first time that I greeted you, some nine months ago, was in Luxembourg.

These two places - Sicily and Luxembourg - represent Europe as it is, a mixture of cultures and languages united in one Community. It has a common heritage, a common civilization, whose cradle is the Mediterranean Sea and the countries bordering on it, two of which are already Members of the European Community, and three of which will be joining in the near future.

I would now like, if you will permit me, to continue in my own language

... Dear American friends and colleagues of the European Parliament, I should just like to touch very briefly on a few topics to which I attach great importance, matters which concern both our relations with the United States and the development of the European Community.

I shall not dwell here on the Mediterranean policy, which is the principal subject of your discussions. I am aware that, on several occasions at your previous meetings, you considered that question from various angles, and I hope this new meeting will enable you to study it still further in the interest of greater mutual understanding, particularly as regards matters of agricultural production and related trade questions.

I am therefore delighted at the happy choice of venue for this meeting which, most appropriately, is being held in a central Mediterranean locality, half-way between Gibraltar and Suez. My one regret is that, through lack of time, you will not be able to visit our rural areas and see with your own eyes the actual situation confronting the farming community in this southernmost part of the European Community.

Taking as a starting point the Mediterranean area, which is so important for us Europeans, I should like to touch briefly on the wider context of world trade to bring up a number of issues of concern to us in the difficult situation the international economy is facing today.

First of all, I should like to stress the great importance European countries attach to the major multilateral negotiations in the Tokyo Round taking place within GATT in Geneva.

The stakes are high. In the Kennedy Round, the European Community fought for the liberalization of world trade, and it earnestly hopes that the new multilateral negotiations will result in a further reduction of barriers to world trade, against a broader background that leaves aside present circumstances, difficult though they be. We appreciate the efforts made by the American Administration, and the zeal with which its able negotiators have stood out against domestic trends of a neo-protectionist character.

We have noted with satisfaction, in this connection, the welcome conclusion in January of the negotiations between the United States and Japan, which will exert a beneficial effect on the relaunching of GATT. However, it is with close attention and, indeed, a degree of apprehension that we are following the deliberations of the U.S. Congress, for we know that in the final analysis it is on Congress that the final outcome of the Geneva negotiations will depend.

It is understandable that, in the present situation, domestic economic problems are the overriding concern of our countries, committed as they are to fighting inflation and unemployment. It is as well, however, not to lose sight of the international implications of these policies, given the close interdependence which today characterizes relations between our countries.

In this connection I would also draw attention to the responsibilities we all bear vis-à-vis the less developed countries, and the common commitment that ought to unite us in the face of this problem. A single significant figure will here suffice: the deficit of those underdeveloped countries that are not oil exporters. This leapt between 1973 and today from \$ 100,000 million to more than \$ 250,000 million.

These are the hard facts to which we cannot remain different, both as human beings and as responsible politicians. If we simply stood aside, the countries concerned might well take up an inflexible doctrinaire stand which would create other even more serious economic and political difficulties. Following the disappointing results of the North-South dialogue what is needed is a new commitment by our countries.

I cannot leave this subject without referring to the monetary problems which are causing so much concern to those responsible for the international economy. The serious deficit in the United States' balance of payments and the pressures on the dollar are making what is already a difficult situation in international economic relations even worse. In order to deal with it, new and more effective forms of financial cooperation between the economically more advanced countries are necessary. We must tackle the problem with more open minds and in a spirit of mutual comprehension, in the awareness that solidarity in this sector is essential to our common welfare.

I would like to finish, chairmen and honourable colleagues, with a few words concerning a matter which is very much in the public eye and which is of very great importance, namely the protection of human rights. This theme has been discussed in your meeting today and is the object of a special joint working group which you decided to set up - very opportunely I might say.

You have discussed this theme in a country which is living through a painful and worrying time, because the attempt against one of its most highly regarded citizens and the murder of his bodyguards are in reality not only violations of fundamental human rights but also an extremely serious attempt to destroy the democratic institutions of the country.

May I express my full support for your initiatives because at this time it is more necessary than ever to bring together all the strengths of democratic forces in order to repel all attacks against our free institutions. We must recognize that not only the interests of a single individual but also those of the whole democratic system are at stake.

Violations of human rights, wherever they take place, and the attacks on major political figures in our countries are - in fact - different sides of the same reality, the war against our civilization, against democracy and against free institutions.

We must therefore concentrate and unite all our efforts to face up together to this dreadful threat which concerns us all.

I should like to conclude, Mr Ryan, dear colleagues, by pointing to the immense value and interest of the work you are doing, and to the important lessons to be drawn from it by both our assemblies. In the conviction that this meeting in Sicily will bear witness to the value of our efforts in parliamentary cooperation, I wish you every success in your work.

o

o o

DocumentationWorking documentsOf the European Parliament Delegation:

- PE 52.811 Working Document prepared by Mr JAHN on certain political aspects of the situation in the Eastern Mediterranean (Cyprus, Greece and Turkey)
- PE 52.706 Working Document prepared by Mr ZAGARI on
A. The EC Mediterranean Policy: Global Approach, Cooperation Agreements and Perspectives.
B. Towards the Enlargement: From the Community of The Nine to a Community of The Twelve.
- PE 52.750 Working Document prepared by Mr BANGEMANN on aspects of Mediterranean agriculture
- PE 52.365 Draft Opinion prepared by Mr DE CLERCQ for the Committee on Agriculture on
- the guidelines concerning the development of the Mediterranean regions of the Community, together with certain measures relating to agriculture (COM(77) 526 final - I and II - Doc. 470/77)
- financial consequences of the proposals for measures to assist Mediterranean agriculture (COM(77) 674 final)
- PE 49.972 Working Document with a view to drafting a Report on the prospects of enlargement of the European Community (Mr DURIEUX)
- PE 52.738 Working Document prepared by Mr COUSTE on a concentrated approach by the Joint Working Party on Human Rights
- PE 52.733 Working Document prepared by Miss FLESCH on Human Rights and Lomé II
- PE 52.717 Working Document prepared by Mr LEONARDI on general aspects of Community energy policy
- PE 52.690 Working Document prepared by Mrs WALZ on the peaceful use of energy: Community plan of action on radioactive waste, the reprocessing of irradiated nuclear fuels and the fast-breeder option
- PE 52.748 Working Document on bilateral trade between the USA and the EEC and trilateral trade problems with Japan (Mr PRESCOTT)
- PE 52.749 Working Document prepared by Mr SCOTT-HOPKINS on Perspectives on EEC-US agricultural trade policies
- PE 52.795 Working Document on the impact of monetary problems on trade difficulties (Mr RIPAMONTI)

Of the US Congress Delegation

PE 52.840 Working Document on Turkey, Cyprus and the US Congress
 (Senator SARBANES)

PE 53.029 Working Document on US Interests in the Eastern
 Mediterranean (Congressman WINN)

PE 52.841 Working Document "Is Nuclear Power Valid for our Society"
 (Congressman RYAN)

PE 53.125 Working Document on US Energy Policy Considerations
 (Congressman MARTIN)

PE 53.126 Working Document on New Rules in Agricultural Trade
 (Congressmen FITHIAN and NOLAN)

Other documents

PE 52.392/rev. Programme

PE 52.399/rev. List of members of European Parliament delegation

PE 52.720/rev. List of members of US Congress delegation

PE 52.687 Notice to Members: excerpts from a speech on protectionism
 by US Secretary of State Cyrus VANCE to the National
 Governors' Association 27 February 1978

PE 52.683 Notice to Members: article published in the International
 Herald Tribune 21 February 1978 entitled 'When Human Rights
 Are Wrong'

PE 51.961 Notice to Members: statement made by President CARTER
 on the occasion of Human Rights Week 1977

PE 51.712 Working Document on Human Rights in the World (Mr SANTER)

PE 52.459/fin. Opinion for the enlarged Bureau (Mr SANTER) (Working Group
 on Human Rights)

Doc. 89/77 Report on the protection of human rights throughout
 the world (JOHNSTON)

Doc. 576/77 Report on measures to be taken in connection with the
 removal of radioactive waste as part of Community energy
 policy (FLÄMIG)

Doc. 576/77/Annex Opinion on the need for Community measures in connection
 with the removal of radioactive waste as part of
 Community energy policy (NOE')

Doc. 519/77 Report on the communication from the Commission of the
 European Communities to the Council (Doc. 251/77) on the
 fast breeder option in the Community context - justification,
 achievements, problems, and action perspectives (NOE')

PE 49.532/rev. Draft report on the multilateral negotiations in GATT
 (Mr COUSTE)

PE 52.030 Summary of the Working Sessions of 12th meeting of EP
 and US Congress delegations - New York and Washington -
 October-November 1977

100

100